

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7098

EDWARD STEEDLEY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD CLARKE, Director, V.D.O.C.,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District Judge. (1:13-cv-00485-GBL-JFA)

Submitted: October 21, 2014

Decided: October 24, 2014

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Edward Steedley, Appellant Pro Se. Steven Andrew Witmer, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Edward Steedley seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition and he has filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Steedley has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Steedley's application to proceed in forma pauperis, deny a certificate of appealability, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED